

Applicants: Suemasu et al.
Serial No.: 10/820,272
Filing Date: April 8, 2004
Docket No.: 105-63 DIV/RCE
Page 5

REMARKS

Claims 9, 11, 13-14, 16-18, and 21 are amended herein. Claims 1-8, 12 and 19 have been previously canceled. Accordingly, Claims 9-11, 13-18 and 20-22 remain pending. In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the time and courtesy extended to the undersigned during the telephone interview on March 24, 2009. In general, the interview centered around the appropriate claim language for the first surface of the substrate in order to avoid the cited references, especially the Schneble reference. In addition, the Examiner and the undersigned discussed the possibility of claim language specifying that the metal layer is directly adhered to an oxide layer, which has been applied to the otherwise unlayered substrate, in order to avoid the cited references.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 9-11, 14-18 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneble in view of Locke. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneble, in view of Locke, and further in view of Chang.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges applicant's arguments filed on December 12, 2008. In response, the Examiner now indicates that she is broadly interpreting the first surface of the substrate to be the first side of the substrate. In addition, during the telephonic interview, it was noted that Schneble discloses the metal layer is

adhered to strippable temporary masks (see, e.g. Figures 1-3), whereas the present application discloses (see, e.g. Figures 8 and 17) the metal layer (15, 55) deposited onto an oxide layer (12, 52) which, in turn, has been directly deposited on an otherwise unlayered substrate (10, 50).

In order to further clarify the invention, applicants have amended Claims 9 and 16 to further specify the forming of an oxide layer on an inner peripheral surface portion of the non-through hole adjacent to the first surface of the substrate and on a portion of the first surface of the substrate adjacent to the non-through hole such that only the oxide layer is layered on the substrate, and then forming a metal layer such that it is directly adhered to the oxide layer. As noted above, support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, including Figures 8 and 17; page 13, lines 4-7; and page 22, lines 3-10. Applicants respectfully assert that these elements are not disclosed in any of the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the application is now in proper form for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If resolution of any remaining issue is required prior to allowance of the application, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' attorney at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants: Suemasu et al.
Serial No.: 10/820,272
Filing Date: April 8, 2004
Docket No.: 105-63 DIV/RCE
Page 7

HOFFMANN & BARON, LLP
6900 Jericho Turnpike
Syosset, New York 11791
(516) 822-3550
JFH:lg

313467_1.DOC

Respectfully submitted,

/james f. harrington/
James F. Harrington
Registration No.: 44,741
Attorney for Applicant(s)